AGENDA
COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Thursday, February 2, 2012, **7:00 PM**
Meeting Room @
500 SW Madison Avenue

Community
Development
501 SW Madison
Corvallis, OR 97333
(541) 766-6908

7:00 pm	**I.**	**Call to Order; review agenda**	
7:05	**II.**	**Review draft minutes from October 6, 2011, regular meeting**	
7:10	**III.**	**Visitors' Propositions**	
7:15	**IV.**	**Introductions of CCI Members**	
7:20	**V.**	**Planning Commission Liaison Report**	*Tony Howell*
7:30	**VI.**	**City Council Liaison Report**	*Richard Hervey*
7:40	**VII.**	**Overview of work plan (presentations)**	*Staff*
8:00	**VIII.**	**Discussion: Quarterly meeting design and structure, date**	
8:30	**IX.**	**Discussion: Brainstorm ideas for quarterly presentations, set presentation topic, subcommittee, and target date**	
9:00	**X.**	**Adjourn**	

Attachments: Draft Minutes - October 6, 2011

CITY OF CORVALLIS
MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT
Madison Building Meeting Room
October 6, 2011 – DRAFT MINUTES

Attendance
Larry Earhart
Josue Gomez
Karin Main
Will Parker
Candace Pierson-Charlton
Richard Hervey, City Council Liaison
Tony Howell, Planning Commission Liaison

Staff
Ken Gibb, Community Development Director
Sarah Johnson, Associate Planner
Claire Pate, Recorder

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

	Agenda Item	Summary of Recommendations/Actions
I.	Call to Order; review Agenda	Information only.
II.	Review Draft Minutes from June 2, 2011 and September 1, 2011	Approved as presented.
III.	Visitors' Propositions – none	Information only.
IV.	Planning Commission Liaison Report	Information only.
V.	City Council Liaison Report	Information only.
VI.	Discussion re Committee work program/focus	Recommendation to City Council
VII.	Updates	Information only.
VIII.	New Business	Will Parker appointed Chair
IX.	Announcements	None
X.	Adjournment	8:20 pm

Attachment to the October 6, 2011 minutes:

A. Letter dated October 3, 2011, submitted by Louise Marquering.

CONTENT OF DISCUSSION

I. CALL TO ORDER; REVIEW AGENDA

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm. Associate Planner Sarah Johnson introduced Ken Gibb, Community Development Director, and explained that he would be taking part in the discussion relating to the CCI's work program and focus. There were no changes to the agenda.

II. REVIEW DRAFT MINUTES:

June 2, 2011
MOTION: Mr. Earhart moved to approve the June 2nd minutes as presented. Mr. Parker seconded the motion and it **passed** unanimously.

September 1, 2011
MOTION: Mr. Parker moved to approve the September 1st minutes as presented. Mr. Earhart seconded the motion and it **passed** unanimously.

III. VISITORS' PROPOSITIONS: None.

IV. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON REPORT:

Planning Commission liaison Tony Howell said that the Planning Commission (PC) had been meeting infrequently, but had just met to consider an extension of time for previous land use approvals. The economy has made it difficult for many developers and owners of property to get funding secured for their projects. The PC recommended that the land use permits be extended for at least one year. Director Gibb added that though the focus has been on larger projects, there are many smaller projects that will benefit from the extension of time. Commissioner Howell also shared that Administrative Services Committee (ASC) had recommended maintaining the 70% cost recovery strategy, for land use fees.

V. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT:

City Council Liaison Richard Hervey also commented on adjustments to land use application and permit fees, stating that City Council had sent the proposal back to ASC for some more work. ASC had also discussed exploring the feasibility of using a land use hearings officer in lieu of having commissions.

Planner Johnson passed out a copy of a letter sent from Louise Marquering to City Council relating to a need to consider the impacts of multiple developments occurring simultaneously especially as it relates to provision of additional student housing in proximity to campus. Councilor Hervey shared that City Council has as one of its goals developing a better working relationship with OSU, and that the Mayor and other City representatives had been meeting with OSU administrators in this regard. It was his hope

that included in the discussions could be a conversation around inducements for students to remain on campus in student housing. Commissioner Howell commented that the City does not collect taxes on OSU properties, whereas it does collect taxes on off-campus housing.

In response to a question from Mr. Parker, Ms. Johnson explained how Systems Development Charges (SDCs) are assessed to pay for infrastructure necessitated by development or future development. Director Gibb thought that the subject of SDCs would be a good topic for a CCI educational forum, since not only the public but many policy makers do not have a good understanding of how they work.

VI. DISCUSSION REGARDING COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAM AND FOCUS:

Director Gibb and Ms. Johnson framed the discussion by pointing out the difficulties CCI has had with maintaining membership and getting a quorum at the meetings. CCI seemed to have worked fine when there were controversial issues to attract citizens to learn more about getting involved. Lately, it has been difficult to maintain a level of interest in CCI's work. Additionally, the fact that the Neighborhood Empowerment program (a major part of CCI's past work programs) is not being funded introduces the discussion about what CCI's focus should be.

In July, Director Gibb and staff met with Larry Earhart, Stewart Wershow, and liaisons Howell and Hervey to discuss the issues of focus and work program for CCI. One of the suggestions was to have quarterly educational forums instead of monthly meetings. The public outreach forums could focus on issues of interest to citizens and policy-makers, or items of timely concern such as annexations or large-scale land development proposals. Committee members were encouraged to give their thoughts in this regard, and some of the points raised and comments made were as follows:

- Public education quarterly meetings are a good idea, and there are some efficiencies with all policy-makers and committee members being able to take part in educational offerings at the same time.

- CCI is also supposed to evaluate effectiveness of community involvement, and identify barriers that keep people from becoming involved in the hearings process. This should be kept as part of its focus, and a better job of this should be done in the future.

- If CCI serves as a quality improvement mechanism, then a survey instrument should again be implemented by which CCI can evaluate how citizens view the hearings process.

- CCI members need to either have had some experience as policy makers or attend public hearings to understand the process and be able to critique it. In the past, City Council and the Mayor have been reluctant to appoint people who have been very active in testifying at hearings fearing creation of a biased committee.

- If the goal is to promote participation, then CCI members ought to be able to get involved with other groups and committees. City Council should consider lifting the requirement that CCI members not be on other committees.

- CCI can continue to meet on a quarterly basis, before or after an educational forum, to review surveys and evaluate effectiveness. Staff could make sure that the surveys are done and bring them to the committee.

- It would be good to identify what skill sets are needed for the Mayor to make future appointments to the committee. There needs to be a balance of new eyes and seasoned eyes, as well as representation from someone who is a developer and someone with a background in land use planning processes.

- OSU interns could get involved with planning and putting on the quarterly educational forums, since work-study experience is something students need. The forums could be scheduled to match up with the OSU quarter system.

- Subcommittees would have to be set up to plan for the quarterly public outreach sessions, requiring that subcommittee members meet more often than just quarterly.

MOTION:

Mr. Parker **moved** that the requirement for CCI members not to be on any other committees be removed from the Committee's charter. Mr. Gomez seconded the motion which **passed.**

By show of hands, the Committee reached consensus on having staff draft a proposal which would incorporate the above-discussed changes to CCI's meeting structure and work program. This proposal would then be taken to City Council for consideration by Councilor Hervey. Elements of the proposal would be quarterly public outreach meetings, setting up subcommittees and possibly using interns to do the preparation and planning for those sessions, and recommending to the Mayor that appointments be made to fill vacancies on the Committee with people who have had some experience with public hearings and with someone who can represent a developer's point of view. The intent would be to have balanced representation on CCI. Ms. Johnson said that once the Mayor has made appointments to the Committee, she will set up the next meeting date.

VII. UPDATES:

Director Gibb invited members to attend the October 19, 2011, Planning Commission meeting which has on its agenda a public hearing for the Walnut Creek proposed development located by H-P property near Walnut and Circle Boulevards. Ms. Johnson said she would send out the public hearing schedule to members, and they are invited to be observers at any of the meetings coming up.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

Since Stewart Wershow was no longer on the Committee, nominations were made to fill the position of Chair. The Vice-Chair position will be filled after vacancies have been filled.

MOTION:

Mr. Earhart **moved** to appoint Will Parker as Chair. Ms. Pierson-Charlton seconded the motion which **passed**.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Mr. Earhart said he would not be able to finish out his term on the Committee, for medical reasons, and the Mayor should also appoint someone to his position.

X. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20pm. The next meeting of the CCI will be scheduled after the Mayor has filled the vacancies.

Louise Marquering
1640 NW Woodland Drive
Corvallis, OR 97330
541-753-0012

October 3, 2011

To the Corvallis City Council

I am here speaking as an individual representing no other group, although the conversation I am about to have with you has taken place in many other groups.

My concern is that nowhere in the Land Development Code is there a requirement that the impact of multiple developments be considered. Each project is evaluated independently, not in relation to other projects that might be occurring simultaneously.

Currently the buzzword has changed from affordable housing to student housing. Right now there are four or five potential "student housing" projects being discussed in Corvallis: Walnut Creek Development Seventh Street Station, Campus Crest and Heart of the Valley. Even the former Oak Creek Annexation on, what I believe, is the Sather property was mentioned twice last week. There is no requirement that the over-all impact of all these projects be considered. However, the cumulative of these projects could change Corvallis significantly. In five years we might be asking ourselves, "How did this happen" It could happen because no one is required to look at an individual plan as it relates to the entire city.

Consider the proposed Heart of the Valley, Campus Crest and Walnut Creek "student housing" developments. Together, these developments are going to significantly impact the area around OSU and Harrison Blvd., but there is no requirement that two of them even be considered as having an impact on the area within ½ mile of OSU or Harrison Blvd.

My concerns come from the Comprehensive Plan

9.7.c If the percentage of OSU students who live within ½ mile of the main campus could be increased from the current estimated 50% to 60% there is a potential savings of at least 5,000 vehicle trips per day in the congested part of the city.
Is that still a goal?

9.7.d The student population is not expected to change significantly during the planning period. The percentage of the total population who are students will decrease as the non-student population increases.
What is the "Planning period"? Obviously the 9.7.d is not longer accurate. When will that be revised to comply with current OSU projections?

9.7.2 The City shall encourage OSU to establish policies and procedures to encourage resident students to live on campus.
Is that still true?

9.7.3 The City and OSU shall work toward the goal of housing 50% of the students who attend regular classes in units on campus or with ½ mile of campus.
Is that still true?

Attachment A

9.7.4 The City shall evaluate cooperative programs with OSU to provide alternative transportation services specifically targeted towards students, faculty, and staff.

Would it be possible to require each "student housing" development to run shuttles to campus at least every half hour? Has that ever been considered?

11.4.g Parking problems can in part be alleviated by a shift to other modes of transportation such as transit, bicycles and walking.
This is happening only partially. Students still bring cars to Corvallis, even if they walk or ride a bike to campus. Since the LDC does not require one parking space per bedroom developers still do not have to provide adequate parking for their buildings. Over two years ago the League of Women Voters of Corvallis met with Fred Towne to learn when the parking issue would be brought to the council. That has not yet happened.

I appreciate that Mayor Julie Manning and OSU President Ed Ray want to work together as OSU moves forward with its expansion plans. That is already required in our Comprehensive Plan 13.2.1 However nice those plans might sound, unless there are changes to the LDC they are meaningless.

I am asking the council to direct planning staff to address the issue of adding a condition for review. A plan would have to be evaluated on how it impacts, not only the near-by streets, neighborhoods and intersections, but also what other developments are being considered and the impact on the city as a whole.

I would also like you to direct the planning staff to look into requiring a shuttle from student housing developments to campus.